



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tubes. Both of these devices involve, however, some sacrifice of accuracy to rapidity. Whisper as well as conversation records have been used in our trial series. But the conversation records promise to give a more delicate measure of hearing than the others, and may eventually supplant the whisper series, which have, after all, been employed heretofore chiefly because they demand less floor space than the more intensive sounds of vocal speech.

It is worth noting that the number-words of the test disappear, as their intensities are gradually diminished by the setting of the reducer, as quite clear and well-defined sounds and not as blurred masses—an important point in an examination of this kind. The tests thus far carried out have been made with original—not molded—records. Should a sufficient demand arise, however, permanent master records could be provided.

A possible objection to the method proposed is that the control of the stimulus words, as regards both their quality and their intensity, falls short of the ideals of pure psychophysical work; but, in anticipation of this objection, it may be said that anthropometrical tests of capacity demand an entirely different standard of accuracy from psychophysical researches proper. The method suggested offers such evident advantages—in simplicity as well as in accuracy—over traditional methods, that it has seemed worth while to bring it to general notice.

I. M. BENTLEY.

QUOTATIONS.

THE ATLANTIC CITY SESSION OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

THE fifty-fifth annual session of the American Medical Association, held last week, was the most successful of any held in the history of the Association, not only in the number in attendance, but in the scientific work accomplished.

The attendance excelled that expected by the most hopeful. With the exception of one of the international medical congresses, it was probably the largest gathering of medical men ever held anywhere, the registration number-

ing 2,890. At the meeting in Atlantic City in 1900, 2,019 registered; at St. Paul in 1901, 1,806; at Saratoga Springs in 1902, 1,425; and at New Orleans in 1903, 2,006. Yet in spite of the number in attendance there was no evidence of crowding and no criticism in regard to accommodations. Atlantic City certainly proved herself capable of entertaining in a most satisfactory manner. The local committees of arrangement had done their work well, and are to be congratulated on the arrangements made and on the successful outcome of this magnificent meeting.

From a scientific point of view, no meeting ever surpassed it, whether we consider the meetings of special societies, international congresses, or what not. Every year some sections report having done very superior scientific work. This year from all the sections comes this report. It is not only the section officers and those especially interested in the sections who are saying this, but those who have never before taken an interest in the sections and who are more directly interested in other societies than in the sections of the American Medical Association are also acknowledging the superior scientific work at Atlantic City. The section officers deserve great credit for this result of their year's efforts. The officers of each section have vied with each other in trying to outdo what has been done in the past and to produce a program that should be superior scientifically to that of any preceding year and to that of any other special society. Those who know the amount of labor necessary to get up such a program and to make a section successful will appreciate that all the section officers have worked hard and have done their duty faithfully. They have all set standards for their successors that will be hard to surpass.

The symposia following the orations on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday evenings were something entirely new with this session, and they proved to be valuable as well as attractive. Never before have the general meetings been so well attended. The symposium on the first evening, which was devoted to a description of the research work that is being done in several institutions in this country,

was a revelation to those who did not know how much of this work was being done. The symposium on Wednesday evening, on the relation of the medical services of the Government to the profession, was also most interesting and instructive. Such a symposium tends to bring the profession and the services together as nothing else can. We all realize, to a certain extent at least, what the U. S. Public Health and Marine Hospital Service and the Medical Department of the Army have done and are doing, but we have been very unfamiliar with the work of the Medical Department of the Navy. Surgeon Stokes, in his part of the symposium, showed that the medical officer of the Navy has a wider field of usefulness than is usually supposed. The last symposium, that of Thursday evening, was also valuable and instructive, and brought to the attention of the profession other work that is being done by the government that is of special interest to medical men. While the building in which these meetings were held was a large one, standing room was at a premium on each occasion. President Musser deserves the thanks of the profession for having arranged for these symposia, and those who took part in them are also entitled to thanks for what they did to make them so successful.—*Journal of the American Medical Association.*

DEDICATION OF THE MEDICAL LABORATORIES OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE dedication of the new medical laboratories of the University of Pennsylvania, which took place on Friday, June 10, constitutes an epoch in medical education in America. The ceremonies were dignified and simple, and were attended by a large number of physicians, principally members of the American Medical Association that had accepted the courteous invitation extended to them by the university to be its guests. A special train brought the visitors from Atlantic City and took them back at night. To those that had not previously visited Philadelphia, as well as to the old graduates of Philadelphia's medical schools, their visit to the university must have been a revelation. Dr. Horatio Wood, in his eloquent address at the dedication of the new laboratories, alluded to

the magnificent material progress that the university has made in the last generation—a progress, one may add, in which Dr. Wood has been an important factor. The new laboratories are intended for the departments of pathology, physiology and pharmacology, and everything has been done to give these important departments an ideal home. The building is architecturally attractive, and is in harmony with the general plan of the newer buildings, especially the dormitories. Mr. J. Vaughn Merrick, in the absence of Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, the chairman of the medical committee, delivered the presentation address, to which Provost Harrison responded. Dr. H. P. Bowditch, professor of physiology at Harvard University, spoke for physiology, and emphasized the importance of the physiologic laboratory in medical instruction, although he did not fail to say a good word for didactic teaching, which must still have a place in the medical curriculum. It should be borne in mind, he said, that it is quite as possible to abuse the laboratory as the didactic method of instruction; and that in all schemes of education a good teacher with a bad method is more effective than a bad teacher with a good method. Professor R. H. Chittenden, director of the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University, dwelt upon the importance of physiologic chemistry to medicine, and illustrated it by describing the epoch-making work of Hoppe-Seyler and his school. Dr. George Dock, professor of medicine at the University of Michigan, decried the tendency to magnify the place of the laboratory, and to encourage students to do advanced original work before the foundation is laid. He also spoke of the neglect into which pathologic anatomy has fallen, and urged the importance of performing autopsies whenever possible. The difficulty in regard to autopsies does not depend upon public sentiment alone, but upon a certain neglect upon our own part. He thought that as pathology gets everywhere out of cellars and back rooms and has a local habitation like the new laboratories, its cultivation would assume a broader and more independent character. The laboratory building is quadrangular in shape, two stories in height